

THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE SPENCER-TOLLES
MEMORIAL FUND

By reference to the April *Transactions* (pp. 204-5) the members will find a proposition from Indiana University in respect to the fund of the American Microscopical Society built up to provide a memorial to the Spencers and Mr. Tolles. In brief, the proposition is:—

1. The A. M. S. shall turn over the fund now amounting to about \$3,300 to the University of Indiana.

2. The University of Indiana shall establish a Fellowship of \$500 per annum to be awarded to students engaged in the study of optics or of any subject requiring an optical instrument.

3. The title page of each study published by these Fellows shall bear the announcement that the author is the "Holder of the Spencer-Tolles Memorial Fellowship, founded by the American Microscopical Society in charge of Indiana University," and a similar announcement shall be made in the annual catalog of the University.—[Editor].

STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR SIMON H. GAGE,
PAST PRESIDENT, A. M. S.

With reference to the proposed transfer of the Spencer-Tolles memorial fund to the Indiana University perhaps the following statement would be appropriate from one who was present at the origin of the fund, has watched its growth with solicitude, and has been in touch with the devoted members who have made it what it is.

In the first place it is well to get a clear conception of the purpose of this fund. If one looks up the history as given in the various volumes of the *Transactions* commencing with its origin in 1884, there was and has been in the minds of the creators of that fund one fundamental idea, viz, to establish some kind of a worthy memorial for the Spencers and for Mr. Tolles.

From the beginning also, the most fitting memorial seemed to be the researches in the field covered by the Society which this fund could aid in bringing to a successful conclusion and publication.

If the interpretation here given is correct, then one can assert strongly that the sole purpose of the Society in creating this fund was to honor and keep alive the memory of the three men who made our country respected throughout the world by their optical instruments, especially microscopic objectives.

So far as I have been able to learn, it never entered the minds of the founders of this fund nor of the ones who by free service have made it grow to its present proportions, that the purpose of the fund was in any way connected with keeping the Society alive or of giving it importance.

During the last few years when it seemed that the Society was on the verge of eternal sleep, the disposition of this fund so that it might surely fulfill the purpose for which it was created, has been very seriously considered by many of those who created it.

At the earnest solicitations of some of the founders the writer inquired of the past presidents and the members of the elective executive committee, and the special Spencer-Tolles Fund committee whether it might not be wise to ask some university to administer this fund.

The selection of a University for administrator seemed wise for two reasons: (1) A University is of all human institutions one of the most immortal. (2) In such an institution are found the ambitious young men and women with the training and enthusiasm to make the researches which could serve as the real and living memorials to the men we wished to honor.

Of all those addressed there was substantial agreement with this suggestion except perhaps by one of the creators of the fund, and two or three who were not contributors.

One University from which researches come in a steady stream has offered to take our fund and establish a research fellowship for all time, granting each year \$500 for the same, truly a munificent offer. The simple question for the Society now is, shall this offer be accepted and our memorial made a real living and perpetual force in our country?

The only argument that can be offered against this generous offer of Indiana University, it seems to me, is that the retention of the fund will be to the advantage of the Society. It will help to keep it alive and give it importance. Perhaps this is true, but I trust that the desire of the founders of this fund will make all put aside any selfish interest, and welcome gladly this opportunity to make the fund practically \$10,000 and insure the continuance of the memorial as long as our country lasts.

It seems to me furthermore that in order to see clearly for one's self the entire series of facts which can render an intelligent judgment possible the following table with the accompanying statements and references should be in the hands of each member.

Sources of the Spencer-Tolles Memorial Fund of the American Microscopical Society, and estimated amount available July 1, 1911:

Acad. Natl. Sci., Phila. (Biol. and Mier. Sect.)	\$25.00	Cortland Sci. Club.....	3.00
Aspinwall, John	53.93	Cox, J. D.....	5.00
The Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.....	50.00	Craig, Thomas.....	30.00
Beile, Dr. A. M.....	2.50	Curtis, Dr. Lester.....	10.00
*Brown, Robert	50.00	Dennis, S. W.....	5.00
*Brown, J. Stanford	50.00	*Duncanson, Prof. H. B.....	50.00
Buffalo Soc. of Natl. Science.....	25.00	*Elliott, Dr. Arthur H.....	50.00
Burner, Dr. Nathan.....	1.00	Feiel, Adolph	2.50
Burrill, Prof. T. J.....	5.00	Fell, Dr. Geo. E.....	5.00
Carter, John E.....	10.00	Fellows, Chas. S.....	10.00
Claypole, Prof. E. W.....	3.00	Gage, Prof. S. H.....	35.00
Coffin, Robert	2.00	Griffith, E. H.....	5.00
		*Hately, John C.....	50.00

Iron City Micro. Society.....	74.96	Schultz, Chas. S.....	1.00
Kellicott, Prof. S. D.....	5.00	Smith, J. C.....	15.00
Kendall, Dr. H. D.....	5.00	Smith, Jay M.....	10.00
Kenyon, Miss Ada M.....	5.00	Spencer Lens Co.....	25.00
Krauss, Dr. W. C.....	1.00	St. Louis Med. and Surg. Journal.....	10.00
Krutttschmitt, John.....	5.00	Taylor, Geo. C.....	3.00
Latham, Dr. Vida A.....	5.00	Troy Sci. Ass'n.....	50.00
Lewis, Ira W.....	1.00	Vorce, C. M.....	10.00
Lewis, Dr. W. J.....	10.00	Ward, Prof. H. B.....	10.00
Maddox, Dr. R. L.....	5.11	Ward, Dr. R. H.....	25.00
Manton, Dr. W. P.....	5.00	Whelpley, Dr. H. M.....	2.00
McKim, Rev. Hazlet.....	20.00		
Mellor, C. C.....	35.00	Total Contributions.....	\$ 996.27
Mercer, Dr. A. C.....	1.00	Sales Proceedings.....	625.73
Milnor, Chas. G.....	5.00	Int. and dividends to January, 1911.....	1815.11
Mosgrove, Dr. S. M.....	5.00		
Newcomer, F. S.....	5.00	From all sources.....	\$3437.11
New Jersey State Micr. Society.....	25.00	Less: Grants Nos. 1, 2 and 3 \$100.00.....	
Pennock, Edw.....	5.00	Dues Life members.....	32.00
Pflaum, Magnus.....	16.57	Expenses.....	19.43
Rogers, Prof. W. A.....	25.00	‡Lost in transmission.....	50.00 201.43
Royal Micr. Society.....	25.20		
Schoeney, Dr. L.....	2.00	Now on hand.....	3235.68
Seawell, Prof. B. L.....	.50	Dividend, July, 1911, estimated.....	99.07
Shepard, Dr. Chas.....	5.00		
		Making total July, 1911.....	\$3334.75

*Life members.

This fund was established at the Rochester meeting of the Society under the presidency of Hon. J. D. Cox, by the following resolution of the committee on memorials: "Your committee would respectfully report that in their opinion this Society should express its willingness to receive and care for any moneys which may from time to time be voluntarily contributed for the purpose of perpetuating by suitable memorials the memory of the late distinguished opticians, our late honorary members, Charles A. Spencer and Robert B. Tolles, and we therefore offer the following resolution:" (p. 270).

"Resolved, That the Treasurer be directed to open two accounts with the Charles A. Spencer Memorial Fund, and the Robert B. Tolles Memorial Fund, and credit to each all moneys contributed for that purpose and invest them securely till such time as an amount may be accumulated which this Society shall deem sufficient to pay for suitable memorials and shall report at each annual meeting of this Society the state of each of said funds."

Signed: W. A. Rogers, H. F. Detmers, Geo. E. Blackham, and done in full meeting, Wednesday afternoon, Aug. 20, 1884.

On Friday, Aug. 21, 1885, Dr. Geo. E. Fell, Treasurer and Custodian, made the following report: (p. 249)

"In accordance with the resolution *unanimously* adopted at the Rochester meeting of the Society, establishing a Spencer and Tolles Memorial Fund, the following report is presented: The first cash subscription to this

fund was made by the Royal Microscopical Society, Dec. 17, 1884." The entire subscription in this first report is as follows:

Royal Microscopical Society.....	\$25.00	John Kruttschnitt	5.00
J. D. Cox (President of Rochester Meeting)	5.00	F. S. Newcomer.....	5.00
D. S. Kellicott (Secretary of the Society)	5.00	Chas. Shepard.....	5.00
George E. Fell (Treasurer and Custodian)	5.00	E. H. Griffith.....	5.00

At the Rochester meeting when this fund was established, there were present from the Royal Microscopical Society of London the Rev. W. H. Dallinger, then President, and Mr. Alfred W. Bennett, Member of the Council. It was at this meeting that President Cox gave his masterly address: "Robert B. Tolles and the Angular Aperture Question." A portrait of Mr. Tolles and a biography of Dr. Geo. E. Blackham also appear in the Proceedings of this meeting.

Mr. Tolles died in Nov., 1883, hence the review of his work by President Cox and the biography of Dr. Blackham came naturally at this meeting. The presence of Dr. Dallinger and Mr. Bennett of the Royal Microscopical Society explains in part the gift of that Society toward the memorial.

At the close of the first report of the Custodian of this fund, Dr. Fell, in referring to Professor Wm. A. Rogers who had made a most generous offer for enlarging the fund, says: "*He (Professor Wm. A. Rogers), suggests that the income of the fund be awarded in prizes for specific original research.*"

Three grants from the income of this fund have already been made by the Executive Committee to aid in publishing original investigations. The first of \$50.00, was given to Dr. David C. Hilton to assist in his paper on the Development of the Liver and the Ventral Pancreas in the Pig. (Vol. xxiv (1902) pp. 55, and 177.) The second and the third grants were made to Prof. F. E. and Mrs. E. S. Clements to aid in their investigations "On the Relation of Leaf Structure to Physical Factors." (Vol. xxv (1903) p. 169, and xxvi (1904) pp. 19 and 287).

In the Society's Transactions may be found Memoirs and Portraits of the Spencers and Mr. Tolles as follows: Charles A. Spencer, by Hamilton L. Smith, 1882, pp. 49-74; Robert B. Tolles, by Geo. E. Blackham, 1884, pp. 41-46; Herbert R. Spencer, by Henry R. Howland, 1899, pp. 252-255, without portrait.

In the Transactions of 1901; pp. 19-29, Dr. Wm. C. Krauss discusses "The debt of American Microscopy to Spencer and Tolles." Portraits of all three are given. Among other things Dr. Krauss gives a brief account of the foundation of the Spencer-Tolles Fund; and makes the suggestion, p. 21, that the name of Herbert R. Spencer be officially added, so that the Spencer-Tolles fund should be for a memorial to the three. This suggestion

was incorporated in the report of the Spencer-Tolles committee, 1901, p. 265-6, and adopted by the Society, p. 277.

References to the founding, upbuilding and legislation concerning this Spencer-Tolles Memorial Fund may be found as follows: 1884, pp. 267, 270-271; 1885, p. 249-250, with list of original subscribers; 1886, pp. 199, 221; 1887, list of donors, p. 326, appeal for increase and discussion of purpose, 349-350; 1888, no report; 1889, no report; 1890, p. 252; 1891, p. 209; 1892, p. 36; 1893, p. 34; 1894, p. 18; 1895, p. 78-80, 94; 1896, pp. 31, 46; 1897, p. 195; 1898, p. 354; 1899, p. 264; 1900, discussion, pp. 206-7, appointment of committee, p. 207, 210; 1901, Spencer-Tolles Fund Committee recommended that H. R. C Spencer be included in memorial; adopted, pp. 265-6, 277; Standing Committee known as Spencer-Tolles Fund Committee (see By-law IX); Custodian authorized, 276; 1902, p. 175, list of contributors to date, pp. 267-8, Custodian's report, p. 282; 1902, p. 175, life members, fees to Spencer-Tolles fund, 175, 179; 1903, pp. 169, 172; 1904, p. 289; 1905, pp. 163-167; 1906, pp. 215-16, 220. Sale of Proceedings to Spencer-Tolles Fund commencing 1898. See Treasurer's and Custodian's reports.

SOME OPPOSING VIEWS.

To the Members of the A. M. S.—

The undersigned recognize the unselfish work of the Spencer-Tolles committee in their effort to make secure the future of the Fund committed to their care. The recent crisis in the history of the Society makes clear the wisdom of taking at once the steps necessary to insure a proper administration of these funds in case the existence of the American Microscopical Society should cease.

We believe, however, that this crisis is safely past; but we recommend that the Executive Committee be urged to take, in accordance with constitutional provision, the course desirable for safeguarding the future of the fund *if the Society should discontinue*.

In the meantime we submit the following reasons for believing that the American Microscopical Society should not, under the present conditions, accept the offer of the Indiana University.

1. The American Microscopical Society and not a group of individuals, is responsible for the fund. Two-fifths of the fund was obtained by sale of property belonging to the members of this corporation. The care of it has been supplied by an officer of this Society. Every member of the Society is directly interested in the Fund, whether he has personally contributed or not.

2. The memorial is not a mere memorial to the Spencers and Tolles; *It is an American Microscopical Society Memorial to Spencer and Tolles*. So long as this Society persists there is no institution so fit, through sympathy and interest, to give form and direction to the memorial. The Society that sacrificed to build it up can administer it.

3. In awarding the administration of the fund some institution will be advantaged. This is inevitable. If, for the sake of argument, it should

be admitted that this fund would keep alive the American Microscopical Society and add to its influence, this would be a by-product of the fund's activity which would be alike honoring to these men and stimulative of the various aspects of the cause in which they were interested. The perpetuity of the American Microscopical Society is not dependent in any way upon this fund; but there is no good ground to forego whatever strength and encouragement would accrue from administering it in the entirely parallel courses which the Society and the Memorial must take.

4. In the light of the suggestions above, we feel that it becomes primarily a matter of the quality and appropriateness of the memorial. It is proposed that the memorial take the form of a Fellowship in Indiana University. There have already arisen protests from members whose interests have been connected with other Universities. Furthermore, such a fellowship would be only one among hundreds of research fellowships in the Universities of the country. It would have little that is distinctive in its character. We believe that ways can be devised by the Executive Committee of the Society to stimulate research in such a manner as to make a more distinctive contribution both to science and to the memory of these men than through a University Fellowship.

5. As an example of what might be done, and still retain the administration, we would suggest this fund be made a fund to encourage research by publication; that its income be devoted to publishing the fourth, or index, number of each volume of the quarterly *Transactions* of the American Microscopical Society; that this number be known annually as the Spencer-Tolles number; and that each of the four numbers carry a tablet or plate indicating the essential facts of this memorial. Such a device would strengthen the hands of the American Microscopical Society in its efforts to extend the spirit of research among amateurs and University students alike; it would encourage the diffusion of research among groups of people not directly reached by Universities by increasing the avenues of reliable publication; it would leave the administration of the fund in the hands of the Society that collected it; and, finally, it would furnish as honorable and useful, and a more unique, memorial to the Spencers and Tolles than any possible fellowship buried among numerous similar ones among the bulky pages of a University Catalog.

6. We therefore recommend:

- (a) That the Society do not accept the proposal of the Indiana University, and
- (b) That the next annual meeting take the steps necessary to amend the constitution in such a way as to administer the Spencer-Tolles fund through the American Microscopical Society, and to expend the interest only of the Fund in the encouragement of research, and to furnish a method for the permanent admin-

istration of the fund in some effective way in case the American Microscopical Society should cease.

GEORGE EDWARD FELL, F. R. M. S.,
Past President A. M. S.

T. J. BURRILL,
Past President A. M. S.

ALBERT McCALLA,
Past President A. M. S.

HERBERT OSBORN,
Past President A. M. S.

VIDA A. LATHAM, M. D.,
Past Vice-President A. M. S.

F. L. LANDACRE.

Dear Sir:—

As an organizer of the American Microscopical Society and a member of the Indianapolis Congress, I most emphatically endorse the above recommendations and believe it would be most unfair to the Society to separate the Spencer-Tolles Fund from the Society at this time.

GEORGE EDWARD FELL, M. D.

My Dear Professor:

The only excuse for placing the custody of the fund in anything but the Society is the supposition that the latter is to cease to exist. If this can not now be assumed it must not, in my opinion, give up to any one or to any institution the responsibility of the trust for which it is itself beholden.

Very truly yours,

T. J. BURRILL.

My dear Sir:

Ever since I have considered the matter with any care it has seemed to me wholly inadvisable to divert the Spencer-Tolles' Fund, and in trying to see what would be the best use to make of the income I have found nothing better than its use for the publication of the Society proceedings. Certainly no better monument could be erected to the memory of these three great microscopists than to have every number of our *Transactions* bear their names. In perpetuating the publications of the Society by means of the fund collected to serve as a memorial for these men, we are, in my opinion, doing the most with the money that can be done. Certainly these publications as they stand upon the shelves of the scientific men of the country will be a more suggestive memorial than a marble shaft or a granite column. I have therefore very fully decided in my mind that we should make such use of this fund,

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. BESSEY.

Dear Sir:

As I understand, the Spencer-Tolles Fund was founded to assist the members of the A. M. S. in original research. It has on several occasions been

used for that purpose. The Society is not dead or dying, but is as alive today as it has ever been, so there is no reason for administering its assets. In my opinion there is no good reason why any change should be made in our method of administering this fund. Because it is not being used is no good reason why it should be transferred to outsiders. Let it keep on accumulating and some day the Society will find good use for it.

Yours truly,

J. C. SMITH.

THE VIEWS OF MR. PFLAUM, CUSTODIAN.

To the American Microscopical Society :

Should this offer be accepted?

Our experience since 1907 shows that the existence of this society under the old conditions is precarious. Whether, in the present state and diversified use of the microscope, the society has any further functions may be debatable; but it seems undeniable that this organization, under its original wide aims and plans, lacks that stability and promise of continuity necessary for the preservation and purposes of a permanent fund. It was created and gathered for the purpose of honoring the memory of Spencer and Tolles by means of encouragement of microscopical research. This research was, like the compass, to reach out in all directions. Now it is proposed by those most active in the resurrection of the society to restrict its purpose to one line and confine it to Micro-Biology. This seems wise and proper and promising new life; but it is, nevertheless, an abandonment of old broad purposes and establishing one single new one. Whether the uses of a fund can legally be made to follow such fundamental change might be a troublesome question, but with the answer in the negative almost in view. As a rule a trust fund can not be diverted from a broad general purpose for which it was created, and confined into one narrow channel. Consent thereto can not be obtained because the majority of the donors have passed away. However, it is of greater importance to examine the probable effect of this projected departure upon the future of the Society.

It may be a serious question whether a change from an all-embracing program to a single item may not harbor germs of discord, if not decay, if the Society, regardless of such important change, will continue under its well-known name. Under the designation of a whole fleet it will now offer but a single ship, and thus sail under false pretense.

In calling attention to this matter I wish to emphasize the wholly altered conditions under which the Society necessarily would have to conduct its affairs to ensure a reasonable promise of success. It is certain that it can not continue under its old broad aims. Under the specialized use of the micro-

scope our transactions did for some years back no longer answer or serve every use or expectation, and the membership dwindled year by year.*

The confining of the purposes of this society to one subject is practical in itself; but raises the question whether enough of the old members can be retained and new obtained to warrant that continuity which our permanent fund demands regardless of the legal question involved.

There are two separate and distinct loyalties demanded of us. One is to the Past, embracing former aims, and achievements, as represented by our fund. The other is to the Present and Future, to the new life and activity of the Society. It appears to me that the two are not identical, but without being antagonistic. Antagonism arises when incompatibilities are ignored; when recognized there may be parting in peace and amity. We should admit that the aims of this Society have been honorably accomplished, and acknowledge that many workers care nothing for, and many members have grown out of and away from it. For this reason it seems proper to specialize also the society itself under a new name and for a distinct purpose. It could with credit monopolize the open field of Micro-Biology. An "American Micro-Biological Society" would be an honored daughter of this Society. It would be honest in name and purpose, and draw on many workers, for whom the old Society was insufficient. And furthermore such society would become a real scientific body which in some quarters was denied to this organization.

However, the Spencer-Tolles Fund should remain as a monument of the name, aims and achievements of this Society. If transferred to the University of Indiana, under the conditions agreed upon everything will be accomplished that the donors and the members hoped and worked for.

Very respectfully,

MAGNUS PFLAUM, Custodian.

December 15, 1910.

AN ANSWER TO MR. PFLAUM.

Two points are voiced in Mr. Pflaum's suggestions:

1. The existence of the Society, whether under the "old conditions" or those of the future, is too precarious to enable us to trust to it the administration of the Spencer-Tolles Fund.

2. The changes in the Society in recent years, and especially since the renewal of its activity, are sufficient to make the retention of the old name a dishonest act, and even constitute a diversion of trust so far as the Spencer-Tolles Fund is concerned.

*The records show actual membership: 1898, 214; 1899, 208; 1900, 197; 1901, 190; 1902, 179; 1903, 192; 1904, 178; 1905, 176; and 1906, 151; a loss since 1898 of over 31 per cent. These figures are taken from the treasurer's reports. The list of members is delusive. The report for 1907 is not published at this writing.

A careful examination of the history of the society makes it perfectly clear that there is nothing of moment in either of these contentions.

It is true that the paid up membership of the Society is at its lowest point in years; it is equally true that many of the older members are dropping out and that few of the charter members are living. It is quite apparent, however, to the writer, that none of this is in any way due to lack of interest in the work represented by the American Microscopical Society nor to unwillingness on the part of microscopists to join it. This is shown by the fact that the last six months have seen more accessions in members and subscribers than any full year since 1883, a period of 28 years. As far as the records show there is only one year in the history of the Society when greater growth has been recorded. Twenty-five new members in the next six months will make this the greatest year of growth in the 33 years of its history. The Secretary has no doubt that these will be secured.

The American Microscopical Society has as strong an appeal to the students who use the microscope as it has ever had. It is no danger of dying if it is given intelligent care and supervision.

In the second place, it is claimed that the Society has undergone and is undergoing such a narrowing and limitation as to make "wholly altered conditions" of life necessary, and to forfeit its right to be considered the same Society.

The writer has taken the trouble to go through the files of the *Transactions* in an effort to see just what there is of justice in this claim. There is no better way to determine the interest of the members than by the papers presented and published in the *Transactions*.

In making the analysis I have attempted to classify the papers in three heads: (1) biologic; (2) micro-technic, including microscopy, apparatus, technic, methods, etc.; and (3) miscellaneous, including optics, micrometry, photography, and non-biologic uses of the microscope. It is manifest that numerous difficulties will appear in classification. For example, many notes classed in (2) look directly to biologic applications.

Two sets of facts were used,—the *number of papers* and the *space* occupied by them. The accompanying table gives the results in percentages of the whole:

		% Biology	% Micro- technic	% Miscel- laneous
Vols. 1-10	Number of Papers..	51	29	20
1878-87.	Pages Occupied.....	52	17	31
Vols. 11-20	Number of Papers..	51	34	15
1888-97.	Pages Occupied.....	76	14	10
Vols. 21-29.	Number of Papers..	74	19	7
1898-1910.	Pages Occupied.....	84	8½	7½

The table shows that Biology has always been the major interest of the Society, and that there has been a steady growth in the interest in it

throughout the whole period. This was true when the Spencer-Tolles Fund was conceived. A closer analysis shows that there was a sharp diminution of interest during the second decade in group three. During the last fifteen years the contributions in group two have steadily diminished.

Another valuable index of the interest of the membership is recorded in the *Transactions* for the year 1892, eight years after the Spencer-Tolles fund was started. This date is nearer to the beginning of the Society than to the present, and the result may fairly be taken as a normal expression of the interpretation which its members have put upon its proper scope. In that year a card was sent out calling for an expression of the choice of the members as to subjects of interest. Of the members addressed, 153 answered. Many of these expressed several interests. The vote as summarized in Vol. 15 is as follows:

Bacteriology, 70 votes; apparatus, 62; medical microscopy, 61; histology, 69; plant life, 42; embryology, 34; diatoms, 27; algae, 22; infusoria, 22; mosses, 11; everything else, including lithology, entomology, micrometry, etc., 13.

Allowing the whole of the last item to the non-biological studies, this expression gives 82 % of the total interest as directly concerned with biology; leaving only 18% for all other interests, including technic, optics, micrometry, etc. This is practically the same percentage that has been expressed in *Transactions* during the last ten volumes.

There has been no sudden nor arbitrary change of interest in the American Microscopic Society. What change there is has been a steady evolution along the lines of the initial major interests of the Society from the beginning. That the studies of the microscope itself and of its technic should now be expressed in brief notes where formerly they were given pages is perfectly natural, and argues no loss of interest. It merely argues increase and diffusion of knowledge. It is preposterous to contend that a society must continue to talk of just the things with which it began in order to be its own legitimate successor.

It only remains to be said that the present Secretary has not in any sense changed the course or rate of this evolution. He has merely recognized it, and plans to utilize this increased biologic interest for the good of the Society, and serve the real needs of the members through the publications. The emphasis will continue to be, as it has evidently been from the beginning, on micro-biology; but the Society will *continue to receive and to publish any matter which makes a real contribution to any department of microscopy.*

If it has been legitimate for the American Microscopical Society to hold this fund for the last 15 years and to contribute to its growth, so far as any change of policy is concerned it is still entitled to hold and administer it in any way allowed by its present judgment and by the terms of its own constitution relative to the matter.

T. W. GALLOWAY.